

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

FILED-
*
*
*
At GARY T. BELL, Clerk
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
M

MANETIRONY CLERVRAIN, et al

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

JOSEPH ELDOW, et al

Defendant(s).

* Case No. 20-CV-00182; 22-CV-00017

*

*

*

*

*****[

NOTICE(S) FOR [“APPPEAL PROCESS”], OR [“EXTENSION CONCERN ACT”]
[“AMENDING APPEAL ACT”] BY THE ANT(S) TREATIES ACT (“TATA”)

*****[

I. COMES NOW, the plaintiff [““Manetirony Clervrain””], Pro-Se, or (“The Activist”), or (“The ANT”) is who is the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) , [“Brandako, Inc”], and [“Francis Cobbina Osei Fosu”], who is the Assistant Executive Officer (“AEO”), at [“Brandbid, Inc”], they are [“Appealing”] and [“Amending”] illegal practices, and decision across their authority and performance against judicial functions [“Section 7-3-311 - Courts and judicial functions”] for enforcing rights;

(a) Chapters 1-3 of this title shall have no effect upon the chancery courts, circuit courts and criminal courts established for or functioning in the county affected by a consolidation under chapters 1-3 of this title and it shall have no effect upon the judicial functions formerly exercised by the county judge.(b) The charter of a metropolitan government may provide that the powers and duties of the county mayor as accounting officer and as general agent of the county shall be exercised by such officer or agency of the metropolitan government and in such manner as the charter may provide.(c) Municipal courts created by the charters of the principal city and smaller cities may be provided for, consolidated or abolished by the charter for metropolitan government as courts of such cities; provided, however, that the term of office of an incumbent judge of a municipal court shall not be terminated or abridged by the charter for metropolitan government at the end of the term of any incumbent judge of a municipal court ending after the adoption of the charter for metropolitan government. The municipal judge shall in no manner hold such office for a further term except by the approval of a majority of the voters voting in an election to be held for such purpose or in the next regular election.(d) General sessions courts and juvenile courts established for the county shall be provided for and continued in the charter for

metropolitan government as courts of the metropolitan government.(e) For all purposes contained within the charter for a metropolitan government, judges of the general sessions court shall likewise be judges of the metropolitan court and shall not engage in the private practice of law.(f) In counties where a general sessions court system exists prior to consolidation, the charter may consolidate municipal and general sessions courts by providing that judges of the municipal court of the principal city may become judges of the general sessions court, and that the general sessions court, in addition to the jurisdiction and powers previously vested in the general sessions court, shall also be vested with all the jurisdiction and powers vested in the municipal court of the principal city of the county prior to the creation of the metropolitan government, and jurisdiction to hear, try and dispose of all cases arising under the laws, ordinances and resolutions of the metropolitan government. It may also provide that jurisdiction and powers vested in the municipal courts of smaller cities that become a part of the urban services district at the time of the creation of a metropolitan government under chapters 1-3 of this title or that become a part of the metropolitan government later pursuant to § 7-1-106, shall be vested in the general sessions court, and that judges of such courts may become judges of the general sessions court. If the charter provides for consolidation of municipal and general sessions courts in such manner that municipal courts thus become general sessions courts and general sessions courts exercise all jurisdiction and powers previously exercised by municipal courts, then the charter may also provide that whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of judge of the general sessions court, it may be filled by appointment by the mayor of a judge to serve until the next general election occurring more than ninety (90) days after the occurrence of such vacancy. The charter may also provide that the metropolitan council may from time to time by ordinance increase the number of divisions of a general sessions court that has thus assumed the functions of municipal courts.(g) In any county having a metropolitan form of government and a population of less than thirty thousand (30,000), according to the 1980 federal census or any subsequent federal census, the judge of the general sessions court shall be considered as a part-time judge, and shall not be prohibited from the practice of law or other gainful employment while serving as judge, except to the extent such practice or employment constitutes a conflict of interest.(h)(1) The legislative body of any county that has adopted a metropolitan form of government may, by ordinance, create not more than two (2) additional divisions of general sessions court and not more than two (2) additional judges and other essential personnel to staff such divisions.(2) If the legislative body of such county creates such additional division or divisions, the judge or judges for the division or divisions shall be elected at the regular August election in 1998, and their term of eight (8) years shall begin on September 1, 1998.(3) If the legislative body desires the judge or judges of such new division or divisions to hear, primarily or exclusively, only certain types of cases, it shall so designate in the ordinance. Otherwise, such new division or divisions shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the other courts of general sessions in such counties.(4) The judge or judges of such new division or divisions shall have the same powers and duties and shall receive the same compensation, payable in the same manner, as other general sessions judges in such county.

a) That "[i]n our system failed or defining [“Serious Crimes”] and [“Aggravated Act”] , so far at least as concerns the federal powers, defining crimes and fixing penalties are legislative, not judicial, functions, the we asking the clerks to serve each of the Judicial officials across the country, their duty is invoked by laws to interne, Nationwide, or pending to file [“Motion for Right Venue Act”], [“BE”] [“Clear Consolidated Act”] By Victim of Crimes Against Various Officials Apartheid”], they certainly have access [‘Pacer’], then electronic resources that must be giving to all, and for the same purpose of defining words and terms into the (“INA”), for the

benefits of the [“Family Unity Act”], and [“First –Time Offenders”], under [“Mandatory Relief(s) Act”] (“MRA”), and to questioned the defendants to prove similarity between ,or [“Non-Violent Offenders”] (“NVO”), [“Violent Offenders”], that is more definite statement to enforce legal rights, or to apply the (“APA”) concept, similarly situated individuals suffered legal wrong because of the agencies actions, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agencies; then we are questioning who is right or wrong; which the defendant must comprehend is a legal, rather than a moral wrong. Under this formulation this defendant, who was able to recognize that his act was unlawful; to testify, assisted, or participated in proceedings; before district court and this courts, to remanded the cases by laws;

The meaning of "agency action" for purposes of § 702 is set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 551(13), see 5 U.S.C. § 701(b)(2) ("For the purpose of this chapter . . . 'agency action' ha[s] the meanin[g] given . . . by section 551 of this title"), which defines the term as "the whole or a part of an agency rule, order, license, sanction, relief, or the equivalent or denial thereof, or failure to act," 5 U.S.C. § 551(13). When, as here, review is sought not pursuant to specific authorization in the substantive statute, but only under the general review provisions of the APA, the "agency action" in question must be "final agency action." See 5 U.S.C. § 704 ("Agency action made reviewable by statute and final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in a court are subject to judicial review

b) To that extent their employees duty must be reviewed, within common sense to define [“Aggravate felony”] ad [“Serious Criminal”], [“Criminal Detainees”], and [“Civil Detainees”] of a relevant statutes in questioned is for declaration of Right, to be clear, they are for enforcing non punitive laws, that is the [“Aggravated Felony Scheme Act”] (“AFSA”), or against the (“INA”) he respectfully moves this Honorable courts within his motions for supplemental to National relief (s) is within this [“Notice(s) or /“Interlocutor of Appeals, or for compelling Need(s) Opposition by the Ant(s) Treaties Principal Act”] (“NTPA”), or also know as the [“National Treaties Principal

Act” (“NTPA”) is giving that right by congress to litigate without time limitation if the laws is so punitive as to be developed [“Fed. R. App. P. 3 Fed. R. App. P. 4 Fed. R. App. P. 5”] that is for nation reliefs(s):

[“Rule 5 - Appeal by Permission”]

(a) **PETITION FOR PERMISSION TO APPEAL.**(1) To request permission to appeal when an appeal is within the court of appeals' discretion, a party must file a petition with the circuit clerk and serve it on all other parties to the district-court action.(2) The petition must be filed within the time specified by the statute or rule authorizing the appeal or, if no such time is specified, within the time provided by Rule 4(a) for filing a notice of appeal.(3) If a party cannot petition for appeal unless the district court first enters an order granting permission to do so or stating that the necessary conditions are met, the district court may amend its order, either on its own or in response to a party's motion, to include the required permission or statement. In that event, the time to petition runs from entry of the amended order.(b) **CONTENTS OF THE PETITION; ANSWER OR CROSS-PETITION; ORAL ARGUMENT.**(1) The petition must include the following:(A) the facts necessary to understand the question presented;(B) the question itself;(C) the relief sought;(D) the reasons why the appeal should be allowed and is authorized by a statute or rule; and(E) an attached copy of:(i) the order, decree, or judgment complained of and any related opinion or memorandum, and(ii) any order stating the district court's permission to appeal or finding that the necessary conditions are met.(2) A party may file an answer in opposition or a cross-petition within 10 days after the petition is served.(3) The petition and answer will be submitted without oral argument unless the court of appeals orders otherwise.(c) **FORM OF PAPERS; NUMBER OF COPIES; LENGTH LIMITS.** All papers must conform to Rule 32(c)(2). An original and 3 copies must be filed unless the court requires a different number by local rule or by order in a particular case. Except by the court's permission, and excluding the accompanying documents required by Rule 5(b)(1)(E):(1) a paper produced using a computer must not exceed 5,200 words; and(2) a handwritten or typewritten paper must not exceed 20 pages.(d) **GRANT OF PERMISSION; FEES; COST BOND; FILING THE RECORD.**(1) Within 14 days after the entry of the order granting permission to appeal, the appellant must:(A) pay the district clerk all required fees; and(B) file a cost bond if required under Rule 7.(2) A notice of appeal need not be filed. The date when the order granting permission to appeal is entered serves as the date of the notice of appeal for calculating time under these rules.(3) The district clerk must notify the circuit clerk once the petitioner has paid the fees. Upon receiving this notice, the circuit clerk must enter the appeal on the docket. The record must be forwarded and filed in accordance with Rules 11 and 12(c).

1) That is for the disposition for issues of material of genuine fact against the agencies and their officials and individual capacities by persuading for investigation that the plaintiff has been a victim of crimes;

2) That is qualifying criminal activities the the agencies while in custody by illegal contracts, and he is likely to be helpful to the investigation proceeding or the prosecution of the various criminals;

a) To the extent the court trying to say that plaintiff was untimely, that is pattern of misconduct by United States Clerk, [“22-1262”] must response is misleading by failure to file timely appealing;

b) The above motion for [“Interlocutor of Appeals”], was construe by the various courts except from the Northen District of Indiana, by abusing immunity, should authority must be declared illegal;

c) It is true that if no one is not above the laws, protecting them to abused another by delaying process, or to cause untimely, that is what the court can not be proving by the records for fraudulent issues;

d) Accordingly, the plaintiff s asking to file additional time for [“Jurisdictional Memorandum”] or without page limitation, it is very voluminous, documents to be included is equity demanding;

i) As well as to inform the courts if \$ 600 Millions dollar, appears to be reasonable for mailing to the defendants by [“The Answer Act”] (“TAA”), as well as to remove from paupers status authority;

a) As an original matter, or existing laws we are proposing the [**"Fees Waiver Act"**] ("FWA"), also known as the [**"Fee Issues Waiver Act"**] ("FIWA") to benefit those, similarly situated person;

[**"Section 552 - Public information; agency rules, opinions, orders, records, and proceedings"**]

(4) (A)(i) In order to carry out the provisions of this section, each agency shall promulgate regulations, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, specifying the schedule of fees applicable to the processing of requests under this section and establishing procedures and guidelines for determining when such fees should be waived or reduced. Such schedule shall conform to the guidelines which shall be promulgated, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and which shall provide for a uniform schedule of fees for all agencies.(ii) Such agency regulations shall provide that-(I) fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document search, duplication, and review, when records are requested for commercial use;(II) fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document duplication when records are not sought for commercial use and the request is made by an educational or noncommercial scientific institution, whose purpose is scholarly or scientific research; or a representative of the news media; and(III) for any request not described in (I) or (II), fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document search and duplication. In this clause, the term "a representative of the news media" means any person or entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience. In this clause, the term "news" means information that is about current events or that would be of current interest to the public. Examples of news-media entities are television or radio stations broadcasting to the public at large and publishers of periodicals (but only if such entities qualify as disseminators of "news") who make their products available for purchase by or subscription by or free distribution to the general public. These examples are not all-inclusive. Moreover, as methods of news delivery evolve (for example, the adoption of the electronic dissemination of newspapers through telecommunications services), such alternative media shall be considered to be news-media entities. A freelance journalist shall be regarded as working for a news-media entity if the journalist can demonstrate a solid basis for expecting publication through that entity, whether or not the journalist is actually employed by the entity. A publication contract would present a solid basis for such an expectation; the Government may also consider the past publication record of the requester in making such a determination. (iii) Documents shall be furnished without any charge or at a charge reduced below the fees established under clause (ii) if disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.(iv) Fee schedules shall provide for the recovery of only the direct costs of search, duplication, or review. Review costs shall include only the direct costs incurred during the initial examination of a document for the purposes of determining whether the documents must be disclosed under this section and for the purposes of withholding any portions exempt from disclosure under this section. Review costs may not include any costs incurred in resolving issues of law or policy that may be raised in the course of processing a request under this section. No fee may be charged by any agency under this section-(I) if the costs of routine collection and processing of the fee are likely to equal or exceed the amount of the fee ; or(II) for any request described in clause (ii) (II) or (III) of this subparagraph for the first two hours of search time or for the first one hundred pages of duplication.(v) No agency may require advance payment of any fee unless the requester has previously failed to pay fees in a timely fashion, or the agency has determined that the fee will exceed \$250.(vi) Nothing in this subparagraph shall supersede fees chargeable under a statute specifically providing for setting the level of fees for particular types of records.(vii) In any action by a requester regarding the waiver of fees under this section, the court shall determine the matter de novo: Provided, That the court's review of the matter shall be limited to the record before the agency.(viii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), an agency shall not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency has failed to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6).(II)(aa) If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply (as the term is defined in paragraph (6)(B)) and the agency provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with

paragraph (6)(B), a failure described in subclause (I) is excused for an additional 10 days. If the agency fails to comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees).(bb) If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply and more than 5,000 pages are necessary to respond to the request, an agency may charge search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) if the agency has provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B) and the agency has discussed with the requester via written mail, electronic mail, or telephone (or made not less than 3 good-faith attempts to do so) how the requester could effectively limit the scope of the request in accordance with paragraph (6)(B)(ii).(cc) If a court has determined that exceptional circumstances exist (as that term is defined in paragraph (6)(C)), a failure described in subclause (I) shall be excused for the length of time provided by the court order.(B) On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall determine the matter de novo, and may examine the contents of such agency records in camera to determine whether such records or any part thereof shall be withheld under any of the exemptions set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action. In addition to any other matters to which a court accords substantial weight, a court shall accord substantial weight to an affidavit of an agency concerning the agency's determination as to technical feasibility under paragraph (2)(C) and subsection (b) and reproducibility under paragraph (3)(B).(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the defendant shall serve an answer or otherwise plead to any complaint made under this subsection within thirty days after service upon the defendant of the pleading in which such complaint is made, unless the court otherwise directs for good cause shown.[(D) Repealed. Pub. L. 98-620, title IV, §402(2), Nov. 8, 1984, 98 Stat. 3357.]

b) So called disadvantage person to be protected under (“NPA”), [“20-CV-00535”], to

remove him from illegal restraint, [“Dkt 15 (c)’], at this point is asking the defendants why they should be acted;

c) The argument is more prevailing, under (“MOCMA”) is to applied general rules in conjunction with (“NPA”), at page [“50 (B)’] defining restraint as serious crimes, to be infinitive to commit crimes;

d) Then, we assumed the chamber, from the Northern district must response before the advocate asking appropriately for their performance against United States, or to apply generic crimes standard;

e) We have said that, to be [“Adversely Affected”] or [“Aggrieved”], then that is for [“National Issues Serious criminal Act”] (“NISCA”) that is to be include if they indirectly or directly involved;

[“***Section 246 - Deprivation of relief benefits***”]

Whoever directly or indirectly deprives, attempts to deprive, or threatens to deprive any person of any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any Act of Congress appropriating funds for work relief or relief purposes, on account of political affiliation, race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both

i) The regulation to minimize Secretive Crimes by officials is (“NIRTA”) matter for [“***Trade***”], and development Process, [“20-CV-0535”], or [“Dkt, 11”], at page 17 (II), or to be served the Attorneys;

[“***Section 541 - United States attorneys***”]

(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney for each judicial district. (b) Each United States attorney shall be appointed for a term of four years. On the expiration of his term, a United States attorney shall continue to perform the duties of his office until his successor is appointed and qualifies. (c) Each United States attorney is subject to removal by the President.

ii) Under (“NIRTA”) is to control secretive crime, for the United States Attorney General , to question to apply more definite Statement, [“Dkt, 51-71”], or to determine if reasonable should have been discovery;

a) The officials had made their choice , decided to committed crimes by restriction, or restraint his movement because the defendant trying to deport him without cause, but false promise, they are liable for damages;

b) At page, 51 (II), is a question for [“***Judicial Official***”] involvement in the conspiracy, they had failed to mitigate crimes, they should never return the various motions unfiled concerning brutality claims;

c) As well as there is evidence for similarly misconducts by the agencies employee, and their contractors can be prevail by the [“***Grievances Filed***”], and the others to be release to each panel of judicial officials;

i) All the time relevant to the administrative record, under (NIRTA), at page 33(C) (1-8) the defendants aware of the situation, which the preferred to retaliate him, that those evidence in their control illegally;

ii) They should have known that their private institutions, at 34 (D) could not perform their duties or interfered with his revolution rights, they certainly cause him mental cruelty to be reveal by records entirely;

a) Although the Court of Appeals specifically relied on Rule 17(b), in our opinion by the underlying;

[“***Section 1404 - Change of venue***”]

(a) *For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.*(b) *Upon motion, consent or stipulation of all parties, any action, suit or proceeding of a civil nature or any motion or hearing thereof, may be transferred, in the discretion of the court, from the division in which pending to any other division in the same district. Transfer of proceedings in rem brought by or on behalf of the United States may be transferred under this section without the consent of the United States where all other parties request transfer.*(c) *A district court may order any civil action to be tried at any place within the division in which it is pending.*(d) *Transfers from a district court of the United States to the District Court of*

Guam, the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands shall not be permitted under this section. As otherwise used in this section, the term "district court" includes the District Court of Guam, the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the term "district" includes the territorial jurisdiction of each such court.

b) That is because the fundamental question is [“***Opposition***”], in a case such as the present, is the right of venue within the federal system is to be challenged by federal officials criminal intent is prevailing by law;

1) We are opposing the defendants conducts,[‘22-CV-00137”], [Dkt, 17, at 5 (iii) (a) if they failed to applied when rights, and privileged , as well as that is due process, it so required to be granted generally;

2)That is to include immigration procedures, to be authorized to litigate in behalf of his friends and the others listed across the Nation to protect innocent people can not be disregarded because of judicial authorities;

3) The criminals are all, they have done that before, there is enough evidence to prove that, [“Section 64.16.005 - Aliens' rights and interests in lands same as native citizens”] is being questioned issues;

a) Under this state laws, then [“Wash. Rev. Code § 64.16.005”] Current through Chapter 2 of the 2022 Regular Session, we are questioning the intent of the officials, or for Alien rights as as Native citizens;

b) To be clear that is for the clerk to inform each governor, the word [“Alien Rights”] must be similarly situated with [“Native Rights”], only on special circumstance, that is to apply the concept for permanent claims;

1) That is because the individual who listed on the motions are parties,[“22-CV-00273””] that is for the courts to consolidate all cases in their jurisdiction [“17-CV-01858”], that is to question leave to file claims;

2) At this point the courts across the country must considered any cases that where previously denied without justification, and [‘Res Judicata’] is not a defense, when abused of discretion can prevailing issues;

3) To that extent,any allegations by this courts, they are for [“Majority Opinions”] pending to file across the country, or against the various politician to justify their actions, or to be notify is for remanded cases;

a) Here, under this cases Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 499 (D.D.C. 1977), the court failed to prove any similarity, or the evidence can [“be prevailed”] , he certainly a victim of criminal enterprise issues;

b) As such being the case any allegations by the district of Columbia is subject to the (APA) as for abused of discretion, or its failure is pattern of misconduct that must be compelled for all cases they failed to act;

NATIONALITY PROTECTIVE ACT (NPA)

II. The Arbitration Act , standing alone, therefore mandates enforcement of agreements to arbitrate statutory claims. Like any statutory directive, it mandate may be overridden by a contrary congressional command is within this [*Motion for /“Collateral Attack”], or Compelling or Opposition (s) Mental Cruelty Act by the Nationality Act*] (NPA), [*Section 1253 - Direct appeals from decisions of three-judge courts*] [**28 U.S.C. § 1253**] Current through P.L. 117-80 (published on www.congress.gov on 12/27/2021), except for [P. L. 117-58], the burden is on the party opposing arbitration, however, to show that Congress intended to preclude a waiver of judicial remedies for the statutory rights at issue. If Congress did intend to limit or prohibit waiver of a judicial forum for a particular claim, such an intent "will be deducible from ["the statute's] text or legislative history," or from an inherent conflict between arbitration and the statute's underlying purposes, this silence in the text is matched by silence in the statute's legislative history. The private treble-damages provision codified as 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) was added to the House version of the bill after the bill had been passed by the Senate, and it received only abbreviated discussion in either House. See *Sedima, S. P. R. L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479, 486-488 (1985). There is no hint in these legislative debates that Congress intended for RICO treble-damages claims to be excluded from the ambit of the Arbitration Act . See *Genesco, Inc. v. T. Kakiuchi Co., Ltd.*, 815 F.2d 840-851 (CA2 1987); *Mayaja, Inc. v. Bodkin*, 803 F.2d 157, 164 (CA5 1986). Their activities by [**Bureaucracy**] by abusing immigrants for the sake of abusing power or in violation of their contact obligation or The [**Federal Arbitration Act**] ("FAA") under 9 U. S. C 1, et seq, and under subsection 2 of the

Act or Violation of the [“ Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations (“RICO” Act,”], and [“The Sherman Act”], 15 U.S.C. 1, et,seq, and [“The Clayton Act”],and [“The Patent Act”], 35 U.S.C 1, et Seq and [“The Copyright Act”], 17 U.S.C. 1 et seqand For the need to resolve the controversies ...which congress intent under the (“INA”) by Ratifying the; [“Immigration and Nationality Act”] (“INA”), 66 Stat. 163, as amended, 8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq for which the plaintiff is a victim of illegal contracts or in violation of the constitutions or a writing provision ...in a contract evidencing of transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration or a controversies thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction....shall be invalid, irrevocable and enforceable , save upon the ground as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contracts. 9. U.S.C 2 and 28 U.S.C 2101(e), and 28 U.S.C 1491-1509, and 28 U.S.C 1715; 8 U.S.C 1332; 28 U.S.C. 2284, 28 U.S.C.2241; 28 U.S.C. 1331; 1343; 1346; that he is seeking declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. 2201; 28 U.S.C 2202; 28 U.S.C 2072; 28 U.S.C 1390; and further states that he asserts claims for declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C 2283; 28 U.S.C 2284 ; 28 U.S.C 3771; 34 U.S.C 10101, et Seq; 20 U.S.C 3401 as well as Fed.R.Civ.P. 15; 19; 20; 24; 26; 35; 37; 38; 41(b); 44; 45; ; 59; 54; 60; 65 83 and Fed. R. App. P. 8; 15; 21; 23; 34, 35; 40 Of course, for the enactment of [“The Ant(s) Nationality Act”] (TANA), or [“The Tenth Act”] (TTA) in conjunction with uniform law, even though the law may operate differently from state to state by invoking the [“Universal Nationality Character Act”] (“UNCA”), with the challenge that defendants are anticipating in a conspiracy against (“LPR), or the plaintiff is a victim of *injustice* by means of *secretive practice* that is the evidence for the claims, that the (“INA”) is promoting crimes of apartheid as his injuries in fact that

must be justified; under the [“Alien Tort Claims Act”], [“28 U.S.C. § 1330”], and under Article III although there is very little case law on the matters, we think that this construction of the uniformity requirement also applies to nationality claims which dealt with a portion of the (“INA”) that provided that the activist can be to have a [“Good Moral Character”] if he had been convicted of two or more violations by the state laws implementing the United States obligations under additional laws, which we are seeking the intervention of the of the United States Supreme court to question judicial function, we ask if clerks entitled to immunity as to claims based on performance, or if evidence to commit crime is established by criminal law, we are concern for the integrity of judicial officials;

[“Section 1251 - Original jurisdiction”]

(a) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more States.(b) The Supreme Court shall have original but not exclusive jurisdiction of:(1) All actions or proceedings to which ambassadors, other public ministers, consuls, or vice consuls of foreign states are parties;(2) All controversies between the United States and a State;(3) All actions or proceedings by a State against the citizens of another State or against aliens

1) Under (“**MOCMA**”), page (I) (1), the plaintiff alleged “ the (“EOIR”) might involved criminal misconducts or extortion by enforcing delay process, this time the advocate is questioning t agencies actions;

2) That is to remove the restrictions against innocent individuals, which the defendants can not denied the claim, then we asking for clarification including National Administrative records by compelling needs;

4) We Are filling proper notification or against the defendants secretive Crimes, [“20-CV-0065”], at [“Dkt, 4”], or as well as under this case number [“21-CV- 62266”], or [Dkt, 7”] they are related matters;

5) To be concerned judicial officials power, then we asking if the defendants can come forward with better Analysis by (“NIRTA”), at page 16-21, and 32-40, and the others are pending to file for debating;

a) The question for the politician parties is prevailing by intellect intent or if whether or not equal protection claim, is clear, framing the activist to litigate in behalf of those who needed the most is retaliation;

[“Section 1330 - Actions against foreign states”]

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction without regard to amount in controversy of any nonjury civil action against a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title as to any claim for relief in personam with respect to which the foreign state is not entitled to immunity either under sections 1605-1607 of this title or under any applicable international agreement.(b) Personal jurisdiction over a foreign state shall exist as to every claim for relief over which the district courts have jurisdiction under subsection (a) where service has been made under section 1608 of this title.(c) For purposes of subsection (b), an appearance by a foreign state does not confer personal jurisdiction with respect to any claim for relief not arising out of any transaction or occurrence enumerated in sections 1605-1607 of this title.

b) As well as under this case number [“21-CV-62266”], or [“Dkt, 7”] they are related matter concerning judicial power, then, we asking if the defendants can come forward with better Analysis to question facts;

- i) That is for , or if whether or not equal protection claim is substantial, to clear framing the activist to litigate in behalf of those who needed the most [“**22-CV-00273**”], or that is for informing majority opinions ;
- ii) As well as to apply most effective manner the court must consider effective matter, [“***Section 2077 - Publication of rules; advisory committees***”] [20-CV-00535”], [“Dkt,11”] to enforcer legality;

The rules for the conduct of the business of each court of appeals, including the operating procedures of such court, shall be published. Each court of appeals shall print or cause to be printed necessary copies of the rules. The Judicial Conference shall prescribe the fees for sales of copies under section 1913 of this title, but the Judicial Conference may provide for free distribution of copies to members of the bar of each court and to other interested persons.(b) Each court, except the Supreme Court, that is authorized to prescribe rules of the conduct of such court's business under section 2071 of this title shall appoint an advisory committee for the study of the rules of practice and internal operating procedures of such court and, in the case of an advisory committee appointed by a court of appeals, of the rules of the judicial council of the circuit. The advisory committee shall make recommendations to the court concerning such rules and procedures. Members of the committee shall serve without compensation, but the Director may pay travel and transportation expenses in accordance with section 5703 of title 5.

- iii) The power of congressional intent, is [“***Clear***”], against those with pretextual contention, or [“***Unclear***”], or they may not [“***Qualified***”], they are question for committees hearing pending for docketing officials;

[“***Section 5703 - Per diem, travel, and transportation expenses; experts and consultants; individuals serving without pay***”]

An employee serving intermittently in the Government service as an expert or consultant and paid on a daily when-actually-employed basis, or serving without pay or at \$1 a year, may be allowed travel or transportation expenses, under this subchapter, while away from his home or regular place of business and at the place of employment or service.

c) The plaintiff is advocating to protect innocent people could not help at the time of the violations, or they are other question for the them to response within the same reasoning standard to be enforce by law;

1) That is to mitigating crimes, as part of the conspiracy alleged to be adjudicated by laws.

State v. Pence, 273 Mont. 223 (Mont. 1995) ,the State first contends that Pence is not a nonviolent offender matters;

2) Under this laws , or Section 46-18-104(3), MCA, defines a nonviolent felony offender as [A person] who has entered a [Plea of Guilty] to a felony offense other than a crime of violence is being challenged;

3) That, section 46-18-104(2), is state laws, MCA, defines a crime of violence as: for questioning the (“INA”), [“20-CV-00535”], [“Dkt, 10,at 50 (B)”], that is for proper guidance concerning rights;

4) Here, Under this case [“21-CV-000137”] [Manetirony Clevrain], who is the CEO of [Brandako, Inc] also questioning the defendants in their individuals and officials capacities by illegal remarks;

a) That is to be clear [Aggravate Felony] at [“Dkt, 48 (b)”], was filed for controversies claims, thus, injuries in facts can be proving to the courts, then the fifth circuit must release their entirely records;

b) to the Federal circuit court [“22-01483”], or that is constitutional challenged pending to file with precise question against the defendants, or to be clear they violated criminal law, as a amending notices;

c) As well as to a appeal each courts failed to consider the claims, particularly, this one, or this courts the Montana court failed considered settlement agreement for this particular claims for conflicting laws;

1) Under (“NIRTA”), which being proposed for [“Settlement Agreement”] against each defendants for conspiracy, [“Mass Deportation”] is being questioned by laws within the same reasoning standard;

2) At this point, or at page 79, he asked for additional reliefs, one of them is to protect him from agencies [“Mistreatment”] and the other is [“Administrative Crimes”], indeed. those reliefs are clear to litigate;

a) This court failed to applied its own jurisdiction when, it so required, for lack Jurisdiction is without Merit(s), [“22-1076”], which the court empower to do so, extension is mandatory that is complexity case;

[“Rule 26 - Computing and Extending Time”]

(b) EXTENDING TIME. For good cause, the court may extend the time prescribed by these rules or by its order to perform any act, or may permit an act to be done after that time expires. But the court may not extend the time to file:(1) a notice of appeal (except as authorized in Rule 4) or a petition for permission to appeal; or(2) a notice of appeal from or a petition to enjoin, set aside, suspend, modify, enforce, or otherwise review an order of an administrative agency, board, commission, or officer of the United States, unless specifically authorized by law.(c) ADDITIONAL TIME AFTER CERTAIN KINDS OF SERVICE. When a party may or must act within a specified time after being served, and the paper is not served electronically on the party or delivered to the party on the date stated in the proof of service, 3 days are added after the period would otherwise expire under Rule 26(a).

b) As well as the court failed to [“Consolidate Appeals”], or to be clear they are for [“Rule 19 - Settlement of a Judgment Enforcing an Agency Order in Part”], that is for remanded the cases procedures;

When the court files an opinion directing entry of judgment enforcing the agency's order in part, the agency must within 14 days file with the clerk and serve on each other party a proposed judgment conforming to the opinion. A party who disagrees with the agency's proposed judgment must within 10 days file with the clerk and serve the agency with a proposed judgment that the party believes conforms to the opinion. The court will settle the judgment and direct entry without further hearing or argument.

c) As such the Fifth Circuit will admitted that a contract was signed, legally authorized by by both parties to [“Dkt, 18”], where evidence for ineffective of counsel will be prevailing, they are matter for certainty;

d) To be response by the agencies, and their counsel for opposition... as his equal protection claim even though it relied upon the same factual basis, and, thus, that the state courts had no *sua sponte* duty

e) To consider whether that factual basis resulted in a equal protection violation. *Picard v. Connor* 404 U.S. 270 (1971). We have examined the pretrial, trial, and appellate papers they are for discover matters;

f) It indicating of an attack upon [“Collateral Attack”], and due process violations under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, if the defendants must follow the same without pretextual;

PRAYER FOR RELIEF (S)

WHEREFORE, The plaintiff , [“Manetirony Clervrain”] , Who is the [“activist(s)”] or (“The Ant(s)”); (“The Humanitarian(s)”); (“The father(s)”); (“The Husband(s)”); (“The Minor(s)”); (“The Children”); (“The Representative(s)”); or (“The Attorney(s)”); or (“The Competent(s)”); (“The Protected Classes (s)”); or (“The Indigent(s)”); or (“The litigantor(s)”); or (“The Speaker(s)”); or (“the inventor(s)”); or (“The devleoper(s)”); or (“The Declarant(s)”), and (“The Brother(s)”], and he is praying these honorable courts to consider these motions for [“General reliefs”], to be include is to compel Illegal Removal Procedures, or for BIA and the agencies to show good to the [“President”],[“Section 2 - Powers and Duties of the President”] to investigate officials;

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments. The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

He noted that traditionally courts have been wary of second-guessing agency decisions to enforce, given the agency's expertise and better understanding of its enforcement policies and available resources. to be served to additional defendants, at their expenses, [“Motion for Marshall Services ; Compelling Need(s), /Illegal Theory”/ by the Ant(s) Treatment Principal Act”] to serve

by federal courts;

[“***Section 2 - Judicial Power and Jurisdiction***”]

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;--to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and Consuls;--to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;--to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;--to Controversies between two or more States;--between a State and Citizens of another State;--between Citizens of different States;--between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects. In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make. The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Then, "constitutional basis for the statutory exercise of subject matter jurisdiction" under FSIA in suit brought by U.S. plaintiff in U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, cl. 1, which grants federal courts diversity jurisdiction over suits between state, or citizens thereof, and foreign states, they are for additional relief, they are clearer to the courts, or any allegation, they not should not be applied because the president and state official duty is invoke in the make of constitutional challenged, against the defendants across the country, as well as those claims will support why to [“***Vacatur Illegal Probation***”] and [“***Convictions***”], they are clear and convincing, that is because the defendants exposed him to dangerous theory, and administrative crimes as well as or the various violation while being a victim of serious crimes by the defendants actions can be justified for statutory damages, as well as for disqualify judicial official across the country by means of the applicable laws , and for the supreme court, and the office of the general counsel to investigation the various claims being alleged across the country, and for the appointment of independent counsel for

investigating crimes and to intervene against illegal laws, policies and regulations, and for the Enactment of the [“**The Ant (s) National Treatment Act**”] (“TATA”), and conjunction with [“**National Treaties Principal Act**”] (“NTPA”) or for protection against governmental brutality by secretive Crimes, or to protect innocent individuals, that certainly can not be frivolous with the meaning of the plain meaning of the statutes being challenged, and for the courts to vacant their illegal judgments, or for the purpose to evaluate additional facts that the defendants must response the claims before dismissal with or without prejudice or to review the claims with oral arguments, and evidentiary hearing, in light of the circumstances to excluded him from the (“PLRA”), and to waiver any [“**Pacer fees**”] against Crimes of Apartheid, or to litigate without any further [“**Undue financial burdens**”] and to question the agencies, if the administrative records will prevail the facts, or if the circumstantial evidence that the plaintiff is victim of crimes by the defendants action and intentional restrict him to litigate by unjust restriction so that the evidence will not expose to the public with this this motions as affidavit, because the evidence on the courts records are substantial by declaring that the [“**defendants**”] are very corrupted for which these courts have additional jurisdiction for questioning the merits on his cases, and for controversy within these motions that being restricted by the defendants action or they are interfering with illegal laws for additional venue by courts to inform the defendants the laws are illegal Per Se is within this pending motion [“20-CV-00389”], [“**Motion for Judicial Intervention and Classification Necessary by Invoking the Movements On Crimes Mitigating Act**”] (“MOCMA”), or evidence for controversy claims or by challenging the various judicial injustice for their failure to evaluate the defendants

conspiracy effecting the public interest by way of Mass Deporation and Incarceration, they are serious crimes for criminal investigation, or proper cause of actions are presenting to the courts for Nationwide jurisdiction concerns, of course the plaintiff is invoking the federal circuit courts across the country for their intervention, or that is because the restrictions, he could not file his cases and, and the motions states factual allegation, this courts should question the defendants for his controversy claims for (TRO) related to protecting against future threats by [“*control theory*”], and to compel the defendant to show cause , or until they provide the reasons that he could not litigate his cases as indigent person, or at the government expenses and if the (“agencies”) illegal laws could have been the proximate cause if his delayed after release from illegal detention or they intentionally interfering with both of his legal obligation and to protect the public against injustice or by implemented illegal or by restricted those with public interest or as restricted pro-se litigant to litigate his rights, or legal obligation without bias , delay the process, or violation of due process against humanity or to protect the public against [“***mistreatment***”] by the (“*agencies*”) and (“Judicial bureaucracy”) that are part of the conspiracy or in other word they are involved in the [“***administrative crimes***”] within the meaning of Black dictionary, in particularly if they are entitle to remand theses cases to the district court for further proceeding, or to compel them as matter of right after release from illegal detention or for evaluating the damages against each of the defendants involved for the constitutional violations, or for his first amendment right by compelling the administrative records against quasi judicial procedures, and to litigate complex litigations and any other reliefs the courts might find just and proper, and the plaintiff is informing the courts that

he will file separate motions in each courts to identify the defendants in their own jurisdiction, or supplement jurisdiction against supplemental injustice or for [“*National reliefs*”], or the need for publicity is matter of right against criminal enterprise established by illegal contracts for the purpose to abolish their unjust enrichment is another claims for additional damages against the defendants, and the courts must applied the concept for unreasonable time frame so that the plaintiff could managed the cases, that the limitation of (14) days to response complex litigation or various ambiguities that is presenting to the courts for the same reason by reasoning power is subject to the (“APA”), or for access to electronic resource will mitigating judicial restriction against those with prolific classification, as well as the claims against the agencies for additional procedures needs to be developed against facial attack, that the courts must perform their duty, or to file specific objections in a timely manner will not constitutes waiver of the right to review by the district judge and the right to appeal the Court’s decision, if the plaintiff exceptional circumstances is proving as evidence for good cause exception, as well as to compel the administrative records from each courts and agencies that are part of the controversies to litigate against terrorism , genocide, and extortion can be prevail by the records upon release for additional argumentative, or consistent with the pattern of these cases by evaluating each of the defendants responsibility for whatever constitutional or federal statutory injuries he is alleged, they are undisputed facts for analyzing by expert testimonial with the same reasoning by (“DIFTA”) ,or because the defendants are exposed the punitive class among array of the extensive conspiracy that formed the criminal enterprise, thus, it is one thing to be cautious before dismissing an antitrust complaint in advance of discovery, it is

self-evident that the problem of discovery abuse cannot be solved by "careful scrutiny of evidence at the summary judgment stage," much less "lucid instructions to juries, and why we doing this way because it is our experience against the defendants, or evidence against the activist, or against [*"The Speech"*] can not be classified as frivolous without justification by the federal circuit courts for controversies, or if whether that collateral estoppel applied to § 1983 claims and remanding case for a determination of whether state collateral estoppel law barred plaintiff from proceeding on § 1983 claim for the alleged violations by the defendants mass incarceration, no matter the facts non violent offenders should not treated the same, they certainly not similarly situated to be classified or to be punished likewise.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____
03/04/2022

S/ Manetirony Clervrain
4326 S Scatterfield Road
Suite 153
Anderson, IN 46013
765-278-9806

At this point the plaintiff alleged that, ["Docketing Statement"] before, by the Appellant ["Manetirony Clervrain"] mail ["22-1076"] they are ["Related Matter"] to be ["consolidate"], Briefing Must be ["Scheduled"] pending the defendants to response, or further court orders, they are ["Clear"] as reliefs that must be ["granted"], for all other cases, where this court jurisdiction must be applicable, they are for majority opinion by federal circuit courts across the country, or transcript is not required because the courts must be compelled the administrative records, they are pending motions, very complex, and page ["Limitation must be granted"] to prove public interest against the defendants criminal enterprises that must justify by laws.Denmark v. Liberty Life Assur. Co. of Boston 566 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2009).

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICES

THEREBY, I [*"Manetirony Clervrain"*], the Activist or [*"THE ANT"*] requesting for justice, and do swear, or declare on this date, ---03-----/---04---/---2022-----, served the enclosed [*"Motion for Extention to appeals extortion or compelling Need(s) by the Administrative Records for controversies claims Act (UCCA)"*] on each party to the above proceeding and envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first class postage prepaid, or by delivery or Electronic to ("EFC"), to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days and the name addresses of those serve is follows for national national reliefs

United States District Court
Northern District of Indiana
5400 Federal Plaza
Suite 2300
Hammond, IN 46320

United States District Court
Eastern District of New York
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, NY 11201

United States District Court
Central District of Illinois
218 U.S. Courthouse
201 S. Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61802

United States District Court
Western District of Wisconsin
120 N. Henry St., Rm. 320
Madison, WI 53703

United States District Court
Eastern District of Oklahoma
101 North 5th Street, Room 208
Muskegee, OK 74401

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

03/04/2022

S/ **Manetirony Clervrain**
4326 S Scatterfield Road
Suite 153
Anderson, IN 46013
765-278-9806

As for informing the courts across, the plaintiff is filling [“Exhibit VII (1) (A-C)”] they are constitutional challenged against [“The Care Act”], if whether or the agencie applied discrimination animus, those claim are on appeals for consolidated process, and the State of Indiana has been served, to explain why? they are not part of the criminal Enterprise to be questioned every other state officials across the country if the alleged conspiracy can be proving by their administrative records [“21-MC-00095”] and [“20-CV-01306”], or if whether or not [“Pauperis Status”], and [“Alien Status”] is proving by evidence, they certainly not frivolous claims to prove exclusion practices. Andrews v. King 398 F.3d 1113 (9th Cir. 2005)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHEN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

*

*

MANETIRONY CLERVRAIN, et al *

*

Plaintiff(s), *

*

*

VS.

* Case No. 20-CV-00182; 22-CV-00017

*

JOSEPH ELDOW, et al *

*

*

Defendant(s). *

*

*

]*****[
NOTICE(S) FOR [“APPPEAL PROCESS”], OR [“EXTENSION CONCERN ACT”]
[“AMENDING APPEAL ACT”] BY THE ANT(S) TREATIES ACT (“TATA”)
]*****[

I. COMES NOW, the plaintiff [““Manetirony Clervrain””], Pro-Se, or (“The Activist”), or (“The ANT”) is who is the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”), [“Brandako, Inc”], and [“Francis Cobbina Osei Fosu”], who is the Assistant Executive Officer (“AEO”), at [“Brandbid, Inc”], they are [“Appealing”] and [“Amending”] illegal practices, and decision across their authority and performance against judicial functions [“Section 7-3-311 - Courts and judicial functions”] for enforcing rights;

(a) *Chapters 1-3 of this title shall have no effect upon the chancery courts, circuit courts and criminal courts established for or functioning in the county affected by a consolidation under chapters 1-3 of this title and it shall have no effect upon the judicial functions formerly exercised by the county judge.*(b) *The charter of a metropolitan government may provide that the powers and duties of the county mayor as accounting officer and as general agent of the county shall be exercised by such officer or agency of the metropolitan government and in such manner as the charter may provide.*(c) *Municipal courts created by the charters of the principal city and smaller cities may be provided for, consolidated or abolished by the charter for metropolitan government as courts of such cities; provided, however, that the term of office of an incumbent judge of a municipal court shall not be terminated or abridged by the charter for metropolitan government at the end of the term of any incumbent judge of a municipal court ending after the adoption of the charter for metropolitan government. The municipal judge shall in no manner hold such office for a further term except by the approval of a majority of the voters voting in an election to be held for such purpose or in the next regular election.*(d) *General sessions courts and juvenile courts established for the county shall be provided for and continued in the charter for*

metropolitan government as courts of the metropolitan government.(e) For all purposes contained within the charter for a metropolitan government, judges of the general sessions court shall likewise be judges of the metropolitan court and shall not engage in the private practice of law.(f) In counties where a general sessions court system exists prior to consolidation, the charter may consolidate municipal and general sessions courts by providing that judges of the municipal court of the principal city may become judges of the general sessions court, and that the general sessions court, in addition to the jurisdiction and powers previously vested in the general sessions court, shall also be vested with all the jurisdiction and powers vested in the municipal court of the principal city of the county prior to the creation of the metropolitan government, and jurisdiction to hear, try and dispose of all cases arising under the laws, ordinances and resolutions of the metropolitan government. It may also provide that jurisdiction and powers vested in the municipal courts of smaller cities that become a part of the urban services district at the time of the creation of a metropolitan government under chapters 1-3 of this title or that become a part of the metropolitan government later pursuant to § 7-1-106, shall be vested in the general sessions court, and that judges of such courts may become judges of the general sessions court. If the charter provides for consolidation of municipal and general sessions courts in such manner that municipal courts thus become general sessions courts and general sessions courts exercise all jurisdiction and powers previously exercised by municipal courts, then the charter may also provide that whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of judge of the general sessions court, it may be filled by appointment by the mayor of a judge to serve until the next general election occurring more than ninety (90) days after the occurrence of such vacancy. The charter may also provide that the metropolitan council may from time to time by ordinance increase the number of divisions of a general sessions court that has thus assumed the functions of municipal courts.(g) In any county having a metropolitan form of government and a population of less than thirty thousand (30,000), according to the 1980 federal census or any subsequent federal census, the judge of the general sessions court shall be considered as a part-time judge, and shall not be prohibited from the practice of law or other gainful employment while serving as judge, except to the extent such practice or employment constitutes a conflict of interest.(h)(1) The legislative body of any county that has adopted a metropolitan form of government may, by ordinance, create not more than two (2) additional divisions of general sessions court and not more than two (2) additional judges and other essential personnel to staff such divisions.(2) If the legislative body of such county creates such additional division or divisions, the judge or judges for the division or divisions shall be elected at the regular August election in 1998, and their term of eight (8) years shall begin on September 1, 1998.(3) If the legislative body desires the judge or judges of such new division or divisions to hear, primarily or exclusively, only certain types of cases, it shall so designate in the ordinance. Otherwise, such new division or divisions shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the other courts of general sessions in such counties.(4) The judge or judges of such new division or divisions shall have the same powers and duties and shall receive the same compensation, payable in the same manner, as other general sessions judges in such county.

a) That "[i]n our system failed or defining ["Serious Crimes"] and ["Aggravated Act"] , so far at least as concerns the federal powers, defining crimes and fixing penalties are legislative, not judicial, functions, the we asking the clerks to serve each of the Judicial officials across the country, their duty is invoked by laws to interne, Nationwide, or pending to file ["Motion for
"Right Venue Act"], ["BE"] ["Clear Consolidated Act"] By Victim of Crimes Against Various Officials Apartheid"], they certainly have access [Pacer"], then electronic resources that must be giving to all, and for the same purpose of defining words and terms into the ("INA"), for the

benefits of the [“Family Unity Act”], and [“First –Time Offenders”], under [“Mandatory Relief(s) Act”] (“MRA”), and to questioned the defendants to prove similarity between ,or [“Non-Violent Offenders”] (“NVO”), [“Violent Offenders”], that is more definite statement to enforce legal rights,or to apply the (“APA”) concept, similarly situated individuals suffered legal wrong because of the agencies actions, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agencies; then we are questioning who is right or wrong; which the defendant must comprehend is a legal, rather than a moral wrong. Under this formulation this defendant, who was able to recognize that his act was unlawful; to testify, assisted, or participated in proceedings; before district court and this courts, to remanded the cases by laws;

The meaning of "agency action" for purposes of § 702 is set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 551(13), see 5 U.S.C. § 701(b)(2) ("For the purpose of this chapter . . . 'agency action' has] the meanin[g] given . . . by section 551 of this title"), which defines the term as "the whole or a part of an agency rule, order, license, sanction, relief, or the equivalent or denial thereof, or failure to act," 5 U.S.C. § 551(13). When, as here, review is sought not pursuant to specific authorization in the substantive statute, but only under the general review provisions of the APA, the "agency action" in question must be "final agency action." See 5 U.S.C. § 704 ("Agency action made reviewable by statute and final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in a court are subject to judicial review

b)To that extent their employees duty must be reviewed, within common sense to define [“Aggravate felony”] ad [“Serious Criminal”], [“Criminal Detainees”], and [“Civil Detainees”] of a relevant statutes in questioned is for declaration of Right, to be clear, they are for enforcing non punitive laws, that is the [“Aggravated Felony Scheme Act”] (“AFSA”),or against the (“INA”) he respectfully moves this Honorable courts within his motions for supplemental to National relief (s) is within this [“Notice(s) or /“Interlocutor of Appeals, or for compelling Need(s) Opposition by the Ant(s) Treaties Principal Act”] (“NTPA”), or also know as the [“National Treaties Principal

Act”] (“NTPA”) is giving that right by congress to litigate without time limitation if the laws is so punitive as to be developed [“Fed. R. App. P. 3 Fed. R. App. P. 4 Fed. R. App. P. 5”] that is for nation reliefs(s);

[“Rule 5 - Appeal by Permission”]

(a) **PETITION FOR PERMISSION TO APPEAL.** (1) To request permission to appeal when an appeal is within the court of appeals' discretion, a party must file a petition with the circuit clerk and serve it on all other parties to the district-court action. (2) The petition must be filed within the time specified by the statute or rule authorizing the appeal or, if no such time is specified, within the time provided by Rule 4(a) for filing a notice of appeal. (3) If a party cannot petition for appeal unless the district court first enters an order granting permission to do so or stating that the necessary conditions are met, the district court may amend its order, either on its own or in response to a party's motion, to include the required permission or statement. In that event, the time to petition runs from entry of the amended order. (b) **CONTENTS OF THE PETITION; ANSWER OR CROSS-PETITION; ORAL ARGUMENT.** (1) The petition must include the following: (A) the facts necessary to understand the question presented; (B) the question itself; (C) the relief sought; (D) the reasons why the appeal should be allowed and is authorized by a statute or rule; and (E) an attached copy of: (i) the order, decree, or judgment complained of and any related opinion or memorandum, and (ii) any order stating the district court's permission to appeal or finding that the necessary conditions are met. (2) A party may file an answer in opposition or a cross-petition within 10 days after the petition is served. (3) The petition and answer will be submitted without oral argument unless the court of appeals orders otherwise. (c) **FORM OF PAPERS; NUMBER OF COPIES; LENGTH LIMITS.** All papers must conform to Rule 32(c)(2). An original and 3 copies must be filed unless the court requires a different number by local rule or by order in a particular case. Except by the court's permission, and excluding the accompanying documents required by Rule 5(b)(1)(E): (1) a paper produced using a computer must not exceed 5,200 words; and (2) a handwritten or typewritten paper must not exceed 20 pages. (d) **GRANT OF PERMISSION; FEES; COST BOND; FILING THE RECORD.** (1) Within 14 days after the entry of the order granting permission to appeal, the appellant must: (A) pay the district clerk all required fees; and (B) file a cost bond if required under Rule 7. (2) A notice of appeal need not be filed. The date when the order granting permission to appeal is entered serves as the date of the notice of appeal for calculating time under these rules. (3) The district clerk must notify the circuit clerk once the petitioner has paid the fees. Upon receiving this notice, the circuit clerk must enter the appeal on the docket. The record must be forwarded and filed in accordance with Rules 11 and 12(c).

1) That is for the disposition for issues of material of genuine fact against the agencies and their officials and individual capacities by persuading for investigation that the plaintiff has been a victim of crimes;

2) That is qualifying criminal activities the the agencies while in custody by illegal contracts, and he is likely to be helpful to the investigation proceeding or the prosecution of the various criminals;

a) To the extent the court trying to say that plaintiff was untimely, that is pattern of misconduct by United States Clerk, [“22-1262”] must response is misleading by failure to file timely appealing;

b) The above motion for [“Interlocutor of Appeals”], was construe by the various courts except from the Northen District of Indiana, by abusing immunity, should authority must be declared illegal;

c) It is true that if no one is not above the laws, protecting them to abused another by delaying process, or to cause untimely, that is what the court can not be proving by the records for fraudulent issues;

d) Accordingly, the plaintiff s asking to file additional time for [“Jurisdictional Memorandum”] or without page limitation, it is very voluminous, documents to be included is equity demanding;

i) As well as to inform the courts if \$ 600 Millions dollar, appears to be reasonable for Mailling to the defendants by [“The Answer Act”] (“TAA”), as well as to remove from paupers status authority;

a) As an original matter, or existing laws we are proposing the [**"Fees Waiver Act"**] ("FWA"), also know as the [**"Fee Issues Waiver Act"**] ("FIWA") to benefits those, similarly situated person;

[**"Section 552 - Public information; agency rules, opinions, orders, records, and proceedings"**]

(4) (A)(i) *In order to carry out the provisions of this section, each agency shall promulgate regulations, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, specifying the schedule of fees applicable to the processing of requests under this section and establishing procedures and guidelines for determining when such fees should be waived or reduced. Such schedule shall conform to the guidelines which shall be promulgated, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and which shall provide for a uniform schedule of fees for all agencies.*(ii) *Such agency regulations shall provide that-(I) fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document search, duplication, and review, when records are requested for commercial use; (II) fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document duplication when records are not sought for commercial use and the request is made by an educational or noncommercial scientific institution, whose purpose is scholarly or scientific research; or a representative of the news media; and (III) for any request not described in (I) or (II), fees shall be limited to reasonable standard charges for document search and duplication. In this clause, the term "a representative of the news media" means any person or entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience. In this clause, the term "news" means information that is about current events or that would be of current interest to the public. Examples of news-media entities are television or radio stations broadcasting to the public at large and publishers of periodicals (but only if such entities qualify as disseminators of "news") who make their products available for purchase by or subscription by or free distribution to the general public. These examples are not all-inclusive. Moreover, as methods of news delivery evolve (for example, the adoption of the electronic dissemination of newspapers through telecommunications services), such alternative media shall be considered to be news-media entities. A freelance journalist shall be regarded as working for a news-media entity if the journalist can demonstrate a solid basis for expecting publication through that entity, whether or not the journalist is actually employed by the entity. A publication contract would present a solid basis for such an expectation; the Government may also consider the past publication record of the requester in making such a determination.*(iii) *Documents shall be furnished without any charge or at a charge reduced below the fees established under clause (ii) if disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.*(iv) *Fee schedules shall provide for the recovery of only the direct costs of search, duplication, or review. Review costs shall include only the direct costs incurred during the initial examination of a document for the purposes of determining whether the documents must be disclosed under this section and for the purposes of withholding any portions exempt from disclosure under this section. Review costs may not include any costs incurred in resolving issues of law or policy that may be raised in the course of processing a request under this section. No fee may be charged by any agency under this section-(I) if the costs of routine collection and processing of the fee are likely to equal or exceed the amount of the fee; or (II) for any request described in clause (ii) (II) or (III) of this subparagraph for the first two hours of search time or for the first one hundred pages of duplication.*(v) *No agency may require advance payment of any fee unless the requester has previously failed to pay fees in a timely fashion, or the agency has determined that the fee will exceed \$250.*(vi) *Nothing in this subparagraph shall supersede fees chargeable under a statute specifically providing for setting the level of fees for particular types of records.*(vii) *In any action by a requester regarding the waiver of fees under this section, the court shall determine the matter de novo: Provided, That the court's review of the matter shall be limited to the record before the agency.*(viii)(I) *Except as provided in subclause (II), an agency shall not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency has failed to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6).*(II)(aa) *If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply (as the term is defined in paragraph (6)(B)) and the agency provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with*

paragraph (6)(B), a failure described in subclause (I) is excused for an additional 10 days. If the agency fails to comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees).(bb) If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply and more than 5,000 pages are necessary to respond to the request, an agency may charge search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) if the agency has provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B) and the agency has discussed with the requester via written mail, electronic mail, or telephone (or made not less than 3 good-faith attempts to do so) how the requester could effectively limit the scope of the request in accordance with paragraph (6)(B)(ii).(cc) If a court has determined that exceptional circumstances exist (as that term is defined in paragraph (6)(C)), a failure described in subclause (I) shall be excused for the length of time provided by the court order.(B) On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall determine the matter *de novo*, and may examine the contents of such agency records *in camera* to determine whether such records or any part thereof shall be withheld under any of the exemptions set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action. In addition to any other matters to which a court accords substantial weight, a court shall accord substantial weight to an affidavit of an agency concerning the agency's determination as to technical feasibility under paragraph (2)(C) and subsection (b) and reproducibility under paragraph (3)(B).(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the defendant shall serve an answer or otherwise plead to any complaint made under this subsection within thirty days after service upon the defendant of the pleading in which such complaint is made, unless the court otherwise directs for good cause shown.(D) Repealed. Pub. L. 98-620, title IV, §402(2), Nov. 8, 1984, 98 Stat. 3357.

b) So called disadvantage person to be protected under (“NPA”), [“20-CV-00535”], to

remove him from illegal restrain, [“Dkt 15 (c)’’], at this point is asking the defendants why they should be acted;

c) The argument is more prevailing, under (“MOCMA”) is to applied general rules in conjunction with (“NPA”), at page [“50 (B)’’] defining restraint as serious crimes, to be infinitive to commit crimes;

d) Then, we assumed the chamber, from the Northern district must response before the advocate asking appropriately for their performance against United States, or to apply generic crimes standard;

e) We have said that, to be [“Adversely Affected”] or [“Aggrieved”], then that is for [“National Issues Serious criminal Act”] (“NISCA”) that is to be include if they indirectly or directly involved;

[“Section 246 - Deprivation of relief benefits”]

Whoever directly or indirectly deprives, attempts to deprive, or threatens to deprive any person of any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any Act of Congress appropriating funds for work relief or relief purposes, on account of political affiliation, race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both

i) The regulation to minimize Secretive Crimes by officials is (“NIRTA”) matter for [“Trade”], and development Process, [“20-CV-0535”], or [“Dkt, 11”], at page 17 (II), or to be served the Attorneys;

[“Section 541 - United States attorneys”]

(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney for each judicial district. (b) Each United States attorney shall be appointed for a term of four years. On the expiration of his term, a United States attorney shall continue to perform the duties of his office until his successor is appointed and qualifies. (c) Each United States attorney is subject to removal by the President.

ii) Under (“NIRTA”) is to control secretive crime, for the United States Attorney General , to question to apply more definite Statement, [“Dkt, 51-71”], or to determine if reasonable should have been discovery;

a) The officials had made their choice , decided to committed crimes by restriction, or restraint his movement because the defendant trying to deport him without cause, but false promise, they are liable for damages;

b) At page, 51 (II), is a question for [“**Judicial Official**”] involvement in the conspiracy, they had failed to mitigate crimes, they should never return the various motions unfiled concerning brutality claims;

c) As well as there is evidence for similarly misconducts by the agencies employee, and their contractors can be prevail by the [“**Grievances Filed**”], and the others to be release to each panel of judicial officials;

i) All the time relevant to the administrative record, under (NIRTA), at page 33(C) (1-8) the defendants aware of the situation, which the preferred to retaliate him, that those evidence in their control illegally;

ii) They should have known that their private institutions, at 34 (D) could not perform their duties or interfered with his revolution rights, they certainly cause him mental cruelty to be reveal by records entirely;

a) Although the Court of Appeals specifically relied on Rule 17(b), in our opinion by the underlying;

[“**Section 1404 - Change of venue**”]

(a) *For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented. (b) Upon motion, consent or stipulation of all parties, any action, suit or proceeding of a civil nature or any motion or hearing thereof, may be transferred, in the discretion of the court, from the division in which pending to any other division in the same district. Transfer of proceedings in rem brought by or on behalf of the United States may be transferred under this section without the consent of the United States where all other parties request transfer. (c) A district court may order any civil action to be tried at any place within the division in which it is pending. (d) Transfers from a district court of the United States to the District Court of*

Guam, the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands shall not be permitted under this section. As otherwise used in this section, the term "district court" includes the District Court of Guam, the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the term "district" includes the territorial jurisdiction of each such court.

b) That is because the fundamental question is [“***Opposition***”], in a case such as the present, is the right of venue within the federal system is to be challenged by federal officials criminal intent is prevailing by law;

1) We are opposing the defendants conducts,[‘22-CV-00137”], [Dkt, 17, at 5 (iii) (a) if they failed to applied when rights, and privileged , as well as that is due process, it so required to be granted generally;

2)That is to include immigration procedures, to be authorized to litigate in behalf of his friends and the others listed across the Nation to protect innocent people can not be disregarded because of judicial authorities;

3) The criminals are all, they have done that before, there is enough evidence to prove that, [“Section 64.16.005 - Aliens' rights and interests in lands same as native citizens”] is being questioned issues;

a) Under this state laws, then [“***Wash. Rev. Code § 64.16.005***”] Current through Chapter 2 of the 2022 Regular Session, we are questioning the intent of the officials, or for Alien rights as as Native citizens;

b) To be clear that is for the clerk to inform each governor, the word [“Alien Rights”] must be similarly situated with [“Native Rights”], only on special circumstance, that is to apply the concept for permanent claims;

1) That is because the individual who listed on the motions are parties,[“22-CV-00273””] that is for the courts to consolidate all cases in their jurisdiction [“17-CV-01858”], that is to question leave to file claims;

2) At this point the courts across the country must considered any cases that where previously denied without justification, and [‘Res Judicata’] is not a defense, when abused of discretion can prevail on issues;

3) To that extent,any allegations by this courts, they are for [“Majority Opinions”] pending to file across the country, or against the various politician to justify their actions, or to be notify is for remanded cases;

a) Here, under this cases Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 499 (D.D.C. 1977), the court failed to prove any similarity, or the evidence can [“be prevailed”] , he certainly a victim of criminal enterprise issues;

b) As such being the case any allegations by the district of Columbia is subject to the (APA) as for abused of discretion, or its failure is pattern of misconduct that must be compelled for all cases they failed to act;

NATIONALITY PROTECTIVE ACT (NPA)

II. The Arbitration Act , standing alone, therefore mandates enforcement of agreements to arbitrate statutory claims. Like any statutory directive, it mandate may be overridden by a contrary congressional command is within this [*Motion for /“Collateral Attack”], or Compelling or Opposition (s) Mental Cruelty Act by the Nationality Act*] (NPA), [*Section 1253 - Direct appeals from decisions of three-judge courts*] [**28 U.S.C. § 1253**] Current through P.L. 117-80 (published on www.congress.gov on 12/27/2021), except for [P. L. 117-58], the burden is on the party opposing arbitration, however, to show that Congress intended to preclude a waiver of judicial remedies for the statutory rights at issue. If Congress did intend to limit or prohibit waiver of a judicial forum for a particular claim, such an intent "will be deducible from ["the statute's] text or legislative history," or from an inherent conflict between arbitration and the statute's underlying purposes, this silence in the text is matched by silence in the statute's legislative history. The private treble-damages provision codified as 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) was added to the House version of the bill after the bill had been passed by the Senate, and it received only abbreviated discussion in either House. See *Sedima, S. P. R. L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479, 486-488 (1985). There is no hint in these legislative debates that Congress intended for RICO treble-damages claims to be excluded from the ambit of the Arbitration Act . See *Genesco, Inc. v. T. Kakiuchi Co., Ltd.*, 815 F.2d 840-851 (CA2 1987); *Mayaja, Inc. v. Bodkin*, 803 F.2d 157, 164 (CA5 1986). Their activities by [**Bureaucracy**] by abusing immigrants for the sake of abusing power or in violation of their contact obligation or The [**Federal Arbitration Act**] ("FAA") under 9 U. S. C 1, et seq, and under subsection 2 of the

Act or Violation of the [“ Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations (“RICO”) Act,”], and [“The Sherman Act”], 15 U.S.C. 1, et,seq, and [“The Clayton Act”],and [“The Patent Act”], 35 U.S.C 1, et Seq and [“The Copyright Act”], 17 U.S.C. 1 et seqand For the need to resolve the controversies ...which congress intent under the (“INA”) by Ratifying the; [“Immigration and Nationality Act”] (“INA”), 66 Stat. 163, as amended, 8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq for which the plaintiff is a victim of illegal contracts or in violation of the constitutions or a writing provision ...in a contract evidencing of transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration or a controversies thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction....shall be invalid, irrevocable and enforceable , save upon the ground as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contracts. 9. U.S.C 2 and 28 U.S.C 2101(e), and 28 U.S.C 1491-1509, and 28 U.S.C 1715; 8 U.S.C 1332; 28 U.S.C. 2284, 28 U.S.C 2241; 28 U.S.C. 1331; 1343; 1346; that he is seeking declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. 2201; 28 U.S.C 2202; 28 U.S.C 2072; 28 U.S.C 1390; and further states that he asserts claims for declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C 2283; 28 U.S.C 2284 ; 28 U.S.C 3771; 34 U.S.C 10101, et Seq; 20 U.S.C 3401 as well as Fed.R.Civ.P. 15; 19; 20; 24; 26; 35; 37; 38; 41(b); 44; 45; 59; 54; 60; 65 83 and Fed. R. App. P. 8; 15; 21; 23; 34, 35; 40 Of course, for the enactment of [“The Ant(s) Nationality Act”] (TANA), or [“The Tenth Act”] (TTA) in conjunction with uniform law, even though the law may operate differently from state to state by invoking the [“Universal Nationality Character Act”] (“UNCA”), with the challenge that defendants are anticipating in a conspiracy against (“LPR), or the plaintiff is a victim of *injustice* by means of *secretive practice* that is the evidence for the claims, that the (“INA”) is promoting crimes of apartheid as his injuries in fact that

must be justified; under the [“Alien Tort Claims Act”], [“28 U.S.C. § 1330”], and under Article III although there is very little case law on the matters, we think that this construction of the uniformity requirement also applies to nationality claims which dealt with a portion of the (“INA”) that provided that the activist can be to have a [“Good Moral Character”] if he had been convicted of two or more violations by the state laws implementing the United States obligations under additional laws, which we are seeking the intervention of the of the United States Supreme court to question judicial function, we ask if clerks entitled to immunity as to claims based on performance, or if evidence to commit crime is established by criminal law, we are concern for the integrity of judicial officials;

[“Section 1251 - Original jurisdiction”]

(a) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more States. (b) The Supreme Court shall have original but not exclusive jurisdiction of: (1) All actions or proceedings to which ambassadors, other public ministers, consuls, or vice consuls of foreign states are parties; (2) All controversies between the United States and a State; (3) All actions or proceedings by a State against the citizens of another State or against aliens

1) Under (“**MOCMA**”), page (I) (1), the plaintiff alleged “ the (“EOIR”) might involved criminal misconducts or extortion by enforcing delay process, this time the advocate is questioning t agencies actions;

2) That is to remove the restrictions against innocent individuals, which the defendants can not denied the claim, then we asking for clarification including National Administrative records by compelling needs;

4) We Are filling proper notification or against the defendants secretive Crimes, [“20-CV-0065”], at [“Dkt, 4”], or as well as under this case number [“21-CV- 62266”], or [Dkt, 7”] they are related matters;

5) To be concerned judicial officials power, then we asking if the defendants can come forward with better Analysis by (“NIRTA”), at page 16-21, and 32-40, and the others are pending to file for debating;

a) The question for the politician parties is prevailing by intellect intent or if whether or not equal protection claim, is clear, framing the activist to litigate in behalf of those who needed the most is retaliation;

["Section 1330 - Actions against foreign states"]

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction without regard to amount in controversy of any nonjury civil action against a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title as to any claim for relief in personam with respect to which the foreign state is not entitled to immunity either under sections 1605-1607 of this title or under any applicable international agreement.(b) Personal jurisdiction over a foreign state shall exist as to every claim for relief over which the district courts have jurisdiction under subsection (a) where service has been made under section 1608 of this title.(c) For purposes of subsection (b), an appearance by a foreign state does not confer personal jurisdiction with respect to any claim for relief not arising out of any transaction or occurrence enumerated in sections 1605-1607 of this title.

b) As well as under this case number [“21-CV-62266”], or [“Dkt, 7”] they are related matter concerning judicial power, then, we asking if the defendants can come forward with better Analysis to question facts;

- i) That is for , or if whether or not equal protection claim is substantial, to clear framing the activist to litigate in behalf of those who needed the most [“**22-CV-00273**”], or that is for informing majority opinions ;
- ii) As well as to apply most effective manner the court must consider effective matter, [“**Section 2077 - Publication of rules; advisory committees**”] [20-CV-00535”], [“Dkt,11”] to enforcer legality;

The rules for the conduct of the business of each court of appeals, including the operating procedures of such court, shall be published. Each court of appeals shall print or cause to be printed necessary copies of the rules. The Judicial Conference shall prescribe the fees for sales of copies under section 1913 of this title, but the Judicial Conference may provide for free distribution of copies to members of the bar of each court and to other interested persons.(b) Each court, except the Supreme Court, that is authorized to prescribe rules of the conduct of such court's business under section 2071 of this title shall appoint an advisory committee for the study of the rules of practice and internal operating procedures of such court and, in the case of an advisory committee appointed by a court of appeals, of the rules of the judicial council of the circuit. The advisory committee shall make recommendations to the court concerning such rules and procedures. Members of the committee shall serve without compensation, but the Director may pay travel and transportation expenses in accordance with section 5703 of title 5.

- iii) The power of congressional intent, is [“**Clear**”], against those with pretextual contention, or [“**Unclear**”], or they may not [“**Qualified**”], they are question for committees hearing pending for docketing officials;

[“**Section 5703 - Per diem, travel, and transportation expenses; experts and consultants; individuals serving without pay**”]

An employee serving intermittently in the Government service as an expert or consultant and paid on a daily when-actually-employed basis, or serving without pay or at \$1 a year, may be allowed travel or transportation expenses, under this subchapter, while away from his home or regular place of business and at the place of employment or service.

c) The plaintiff is advocating to protect innocent people could not help at the time of the violations, or they are other question for the them to response within the same reasoning standard to be enforce by law;

1) That is to mitigating crimes, as part of the conspiracy alleged to be adjudicated by laws.

State v. Pence, 273 Mont. 223 (Mont. 1995) ,the State first contends that Pence is not a nonviolent offender matters;

2) Under this laws , or Section 46-18-104(3), MCA, defines a nonviolent felony offender as [A person] who has entered a [Plea of Guilty] to a felony offense other than a crime of violence is being challenged;

3) That, section 46-18-104(2), is state laws, MCA, defines a crime of violence as: for questioning the (“INA”), [“20-CV-00535”], [“Dkt, 10,at 50 (B)”), that is for proper guidance concerning rights;

4) Here, Under this case [“21-CV-000137”] [Manetirony Clervrain], who is the CEO of [Brandako, Inc] also questioning the defendants in their individuals and officials capacities by illegal remarks;

a) That is to be clear [Aggravate Felony] at [“Dkt, 48 (b)”), was filed for controversies claims, thus, injuries in facts can be proving to the courts, then the fifth circuit must release their entirely records;

b) to the Federal circuit court [“22-01483”], or that is constitutional challenged pending to file with precise question against the defendants, or to be clear they violated criminal law, as a amending notices;

c) As well as to a appeal each courts failed to consider the claims, particularly, this one, or this courts the Montana court failed considered settlement agreement for this particular claims for conflicting laws;

1) Under (“NIRTA”), which being proposed for [“Settlement Agreement”] against each defendants for conspiracy, [“Mass Deportation”] is being questioned by laws within the same reasoning standard;

2) At this point, or at page 79, he asked for additional reliefs, one of them is to protect him from agencies [“Mistreatment”] and the other is [“Administrative Crimes”], indeed. those reliefs are clear to litigate;

a) This court failed to applied its own jurisdiction when, it so required, for lack Jurisdiction is without Merit(s), [“22-1076”], which the court empower to do so, extension is mandatory that is complexity case;

[“Rule 26 - Computing and Extending Time”]

(b) EXTENDING TIME. For good cause, the court may extend the time prescribed by these rules or by its order to perform any act, or may permit an act to be done after that time expires. But the court may not extend the time to file:(1) a notice of appeal (except as authorized in Rule 4) or a petition for permission to appeal; or(2) a notice of appeal from or a petition to enjoin, set aside, suspend, modify, enforce, or otherwise review an order of an administrative agency, board, commission, or officer of the United States, unless specifically authorized by law.(c) ADDITIONAL TIME AFTER CERTAIN KINDS OF SERVICE. When a party may or must act within a specified time after being served, and the paper is not served electronically on the party or delivered to the party on the date stated in the proof of service, 3 days are added after the period would otherwise expire under Rule 26(a).

b) As well as the court failed to [“Consolidate Appeals”], or to be clear they are for [“Rule 19 - Settlement of a Judgment Enforcing an Agency Order in Part”], that is for remanded the cases procedures;

When the court files an opinion directing entry of judgment enforcing the agency's order in part, the agency must within 14 days file with the clerk and serve on each other party a proposed judgment conforming to the opinion. A party who disagrees with the agency's proposed judgment must within 10 days file with the clerk and serve the agency with a proposed judgment that the party believes conforms to the opinion. The court will settle the judgment and direct entry without further hearing or argument.

c) As such the Fifth Circuit will admitted that a contract was signed, legally authorized by by both parties to [“Dkt, 18”], where evidence for ineffective of counsel will be prevailing, they are matter for certainty;

d) To be response by the agencies, and their counsel for opposition... as his equal protection claim even though it relied upon the same factual basis, and, thus, that the state courts had no *sua sponte* duty

e) To consider whether that factual basis resulted in a equal protection violation. *Picard v. Connor* 404 U.S. 270 (1971). We have examined the pretrial, trial, and appellate papers they are for discover matters;

f) It indicating of an attack upon [“Collateral Attack”], and due process violations under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, if the defendants must follow the same without pretextual;

PRAYER FOR RELIEF (S)

WHEREFORE, The plaintiff , [“Manetirony Clervrain”] , Who is the [“activist(s)”] or (“The Ant(s)”); (“The Humanitarian(s)”); (“The father(s)”); (“The Husband(s)”); (“The Minor(s)”); (“The Children”); (“The Representative(s)”); or (“The Attorney(s)”); or (“The Competent(s)”); (“The Protected Classes (s)”); or (“The Indigent(s)”); or (“The litigantor(s)”); or (“The Speaker(s)”); or (“the inventor(s)”); or (“The devleoper(s)”); or (“The Declarant(s)”), and (“The Brother(s)”], and he is praying these honorable courts to consider these motions for [“General reliefs”], to be include is to compel Illegal Removal Procedures, or for BIA and the agencies to show good to the [“President”],[“Section 2 - Powers and Duties of the President”] to investigate officials;

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments. The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

He noted that traditionally courts have been wary of second-guessing agency decisions to enforce, given the agency's expertise and better understanding of its enforcement policies and available resources, to be served to additional defendants, at their expenses, [“Motion for Marshall Services ; Compelling Need(s), [Illegal Theory”] by the Ant(s) Treatment Principal Act”] to serve

by federal courts;

[“*Section 2 - Judicial Power and Jurisdiction*”]

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;--to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and Consuls;--to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;--to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;--to Controversies between two or more States;--between a State and Citizens of another State;--between Citizens of different States;--between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects. In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make. The Trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Then, "constitutional basis for the statutory exercise of subject matter jurisdiction" under FSIA in suit brought by U.S. plaintiff in U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, cl. 1, which grants federal courts diversity jurisdiction over suits between state, or citizens thereof, and foreign states, they are for additional relief, they are clearer to the courts, or any allegation, they not should not be applied because the president and state official duty is invoke in the make of constitutional challenged, against the defendants across the country, as well as those claims will support why to [“*Vacatur Illegal Probation*”] and [“*Convictions*”], they are clear and convincing, that is because the defendants exposed him to dangerous theory, and administrative crimes as well as or the various violation while being a victim of serious crimes by the defendants actions can be justified for statutory damages, as well as for disqualify judicial official across the country by means of the applicable laws , and for the supreme court, and the office of the general counsel to investigation the various claims being alleged across the country, and for the appointment of independent counsel for

investigating crimes and to intervene against illegal laws, policies and regulations, and for the Enactment of the [“**The Ant (s) National Treatment Act**”] (“TATA”), and conjunction with [“**National Treaties Principal Act**”] (“NTPA”) or for protection against governmental brutality by secretive Crimes, or to protect innocent individuals, that certainly can not be frivolous with the meaning of the plain meaning of the statutes being challenged, and for the courts to vacant their illegal judgments, or for the purpose to evaluate additional facts that the defendants must response the claims before dismissal with or without prejudice or to review the claims with oral arguments, and evidentiary hearing, in light of the circumstances to excluded him from the (“PLRA”), and to waiver any [“**Pacer fees**”] against Crimes of Apartheid, or to litigate without any further [“**Undue financial burdens**”] and to question the agencies, if the administrative records will prevail the facts, or if the circumstantial evidence that the plaintiff is victim of crimes by the defendants action and intentional restrict him to litigate by unjust restriction so that the evidence will not expose to the public with this this motions as affidavit, because the evidence on the courts records are substantial by declaring that the [“**defendants**”] are very corrupted for which these courts have additional jurisdiction for questioning the merits on his cases, and for controversy within these motions that being restricted by the defendants action or they are interfering with illegal laws for additional venue by courts to inform the defendants the laws are illegal Per Se is within this pending motion [“20-CV-00389”], [“**Motion for Judicial Intervention and Classification Necessary by Invoking the Movements On Crimes Mitigating Act**”] (“MOCMA”), or evidence for controversy claims or by challenging the various judicial injustice for their failure to evaluate the defendants


conspiracy effecting the public interest by way of Mass Deporation and Incarceration, they are serious crimes for criminal investigation, or proper cause of actions are presenting to the courts for Nationwide jurisdiction concerns, of course the plaintiff is invoking the federal circuit courts across the country for their intervention, or that is because the restrictions, he could not file his cases and, and the motions states factual allegation, this courts should question the defendants for his controversy claims for (TRO) related to protecting against future threats by [“*control theory*”], and to compel the defendant to show cause , or until they provide the reasons that he could not litigate his cases as indigent person, or at the government expenses and if the (“agencies”) illegal laws could have been the proximate cause if his delayed after release from illegal detention or they intentionally interfering with both of his legal obligation and to protect the public against injustice or by implemented illegal or by restricted those with public interest or as restricted pro-se litigant to litigate his rights, or legal obligation without bias , delay the process, or violation of due process against humanity or to protect the public against [“***mistreatment***”] by the (“*agencies*”) and (“Judicial bureaucracy”) that are part of the conspiracy or in other word they are involved in the [“*administrative crimes*”] within the meaning of Black dictionary, in particularly if they are entitle to remand theses cases to the district court for further proceeding, or to compel them as matter of right after release from illegal detention or for evaluating the damages against each of the defendants involved for the constitutional violations, or for his first amendment right by compelling the administrative records against quasi judicial procedures, and to litigate complex litigations and any other reliefs the courts might find just and proper, and the plaintiff is informing the courts that

he will file separate motions in each courts to identify the defendants in their own jurisdiction, or supplement jurisdiction against supplemental injustice or for [“*National reliefs*”], or the need for publicity is matter of right against criminal enterprise established by illegal contracts for the purpose to abolish their unjust enrichment is another claims for additional damages against the defendants, and the courts must applied the concept for unreasonable time frame so that the plaintiff could managed the cases, that the limitation of (14) days to response complex litigation or various ambiguities that is presenting to the courts for the same reason by reasoning power is subject to the (“APA”), or for access to electronic resource will mitigating judicial restriction against those with prolific classification, as well as the claims against the agencies for additional procedures needs to be developed against facial attack, that the courts must perform their duty, or to file specific objections in a timely manner will not constitutes waiver of the right to review by the district judge and the right to appeal the Court’s decision, if the plaintiff exceptional circumstances is proving as evidence for good cause exception, as well as to compel the administrative records from each courts and agencies that are part of the controversies to litigate against terrorism , genocide, and extortion can be prevail by the records upon release for additional argumentative, or consistent with the pattern of these cases by evaluating each of the defendants responsibility for whatever constitutional or federal statutory injuries he is alleged, they are undisputed facts for analyzing by expert testimonial with the same reasoning by (“DIFTA”) ,or because the defendants are exposed the punitive class among array of the extensive conspiracy that formed the criminal enterprise, thus, it is one thing to be cautious before dismissing an antitrust complaint in advance of discovery, it is

self-evident that the problem of discovery abuse cannot be solved by "careful scrutiny of evidence at the summary judgment stage," much less "lucid instructions to juries, and why we doing this way because it is our experience against the defendants, or evidence against the activist, or against [*"The Speech"*] can not be classified as frivolous without justification by the federal circuit courts for controversies, or if whether that collateral estoppel applied to § 1983 claims and remanding case for a determination of whether state collateral estoppel law barred plaintiff from proceeding on § 1983 claim for the alleged violations by the defendants mass incarceration, no matter the facts non violent offenders should not treated the same, they certainly not similarly situated to be classified or to be punished likewise.

Date: _____
03/04/2022

Respectfully submitted,



S/ **Manetirony Clevrain**
4326 S Scatterfield Road
Suite 153
Anderson, IN 46013
765-278-9806

At this point the plaintiff alleged that, I "Docketing Statement" before, by the Appellant [Manetirony Clevrain] mail ["22-1076"] they are ["Related Matter"] to be ["consolidate"], Briefing Must be ["Scheduled"] pending the defendants to response, or further court orders, they are ["Clear"] as reliefs that must be ["granted"], for all other cases, where this court jurisdiction must be applicable, they are for majority opinion by federal circuit courts across the country, or transcript is not required because the courts must be compelled the administrative records, they are pending motions, very complex, and page ["Limitation must be granted"] to prove public interest against the defendants criminal enterprises that must justify by laws. Denmark v. Liberty Life Assur. Co. of Boston 566 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2009).

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICES

THEREBY, I [***"Manetirony Clervrain"***], the Activist or [***"THE ANT"***] requesting for justice, and do swear, or declare on this date, ---03-----/---04---/---2022-----, served the enclosed [***"Motion for Extention to appeals extortion or compelling Need(s) by the Administrative Records for controversies claims Act (UCCA)***] on each party to the above proceeding and envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first class postage prepaid, or by delivery or Electronic to ("EFC"), to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days and the name addresses of those serve is follows for national national reliefs

United States District Court
Northern District of Indiana
5400 Federal Plaza
Suite 2300
Hammond, IN 46320


United States District Court
Eastern District of New York
225 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, NY 11201

United States District Court
Central District of Illinois
218 U.S. Courthouse
201 S. Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61802

United States District Court
Western District of Wisconsin
120 N. Henry St., Rm. 320
Madison, WI 53703

United States District Court
Eastern District of Oklahoma
101 North 5th Street, Room 208
Muskogee, OK 74401

Respectfully submitted,



S/ **Manetirony Clervrain**
4326 S Scatterfield Road
Suite 153
Anderson, IN 46013
765-278-9806

Date: _____

03/04/2022

As for informing the courts across, the plaintiff is filling ["Exhibit VII (1) (A-C)"] they are constitutional challenged against ["The Care Act"], if whether or the agencie applied discrimination animus, those claim are on appeals for consolidated process, and the State of Indiana has been served, to explain why? they are not part of the criminal Enterprise to be questioned every other state officials across the country if the alleged conspiracy can be proving by their administrative records ["21-MC-00095"] and ["20-CV-01306"], or if whether or not ["Pauperis Status"], and ["Alien Status"] is proving by evidence, they certainly not frivolous claims to prove exclusion practices. Andrews v. King 398 F.3d 1113 (9th Cir. 2005)

PRIORITY MAIL
FLAT RATE
POSTAGE REQUIRED

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL



PRIOR
MA

Manetirony Clervrain
Brandako, Inc
4326 S Scatterfield Rd Suite 153
Anderson, IN 46013



United States District Court
Northern District of Indiana
5400 Federal Plaza Suite 2300
Hammond, IN 46320

- Date of delivery sp.
- USPS TRACKING™ if international destination
- Limited international
- Pick up available.*

EXPECTED DELIVERY DAY: 03/22/22

USPS TRACKING® #



9505 5108 5772 2078 5406 80

Package Pickup,
scan the QR code.

